BACONIANA.

VOL. I. *Third Series.* JULY, 1903. No. 3.

A CONTRAST.

Audi alteram partem.

THE *Monthly Review* for May contains two articles on the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy. In the first the Editor criticises a recent anonymous book; and to his criticism it may be worth while to add, that we might have been spared the offensive insinuations against Bacon, founded on an ambiguous word used by Aubrey (innocent in its literal sense, but perverted in classical use), had the writer considered and quoted the context, which plainly shews that Aubrey intended no such slur on Bacon's moral character. He speaks indeed with contempt of the crowd of youthful attendants by whom the Chancellor in his state loved to be surrounded, some of whom abused their position and took bribes; but is careful to add that "his lordship always gave judgment *secundum æquum et bonum*," and after declaring that Bacon's Essays "first opened his understanding as to morals," and enumerating Bacon's friends and admirers, and among them Lord Herbert of Cherbury, John Donne Dean of St. Paul's, George Herbert and Thomas Hobbes, he concludes thus:—"In short, all that were great and good loved and honoured him." It is not possible that Aubrey meant, as is suggested, to insinuate at the same

time that the Chancellor lived a vicious and disgraceful life. This is a misinterpretation, which taints the book and destroys its value. Aubrey, moreover, was no contemporary witness, he was born only a month before Bacon's death, and wrote 55 years later; but had he been retailing malicious gossip, which plainly he never intended, the witness of those, who knew Bacon most intimately in his lifetime, would confute the slander.

Ben Jonson wrote: "No accident could do harm to his virtue, but rather make it manifest."

Sir Tobie Matthew said: "It is not his greatness I admire, but his virtue." It is not the favours I have received (infinite though they be), but his *whole life and character*. And Francis Osborne declared: "He struck all men with an awful reverence."

The second article contrasts Shakespeare and Bacon. "Certainly," it is said, "more ridicule than argument or eloquence has been expended upon the Baconian theory." The article proposes to supply the argument and eloquence hitherto lacking, and points the contrast to the disadvantage of Bacon.

Of Bacon's life, it is said, we know much, of Shakespeare the man, but little, of the Author of the Plays a good deal may be inferred. The question proposed is with which of the two contrasted lives, of Bacon or of Shakespeare, that inference best accords.

The first and main test offered is the ideal of woman presented in the Plays. Was Francis Bacon, or William Shakespeare the man who could conceive this noble ideal?

Francis Bacon, it is argued, was cold and calculating. He is not known to have contemplated marriage, until at 37 he sought unsuccessfully the hand of the beautiful and wealthy widow of Sir William Hatton. Some satire is expended on the fact that Bacon asked his patron Essex to aid his suit, which doubtless would mend his

fortunes. Such influence was in those days necessary, when the hand of a wealthy heiress was sought. It was exerted, but ineffectually; Lady Hatton was compelled to marry Coke, though that marriage proved intolerable.

As soon as his fortunes were established, and his appointment as Solicitor-General seemed secure, Bacon married Alice Barnham; "an handsome maiden to my liking." A groundless doubt is expressed whether Alice Barnham was really handsome, and a suspicion that she was ugly and married for her gold. In fact, Bacon settled on her double the amount of her fortune; and she, twenty years later, was still attractive enough to be married again a few months after Bacon's death.

Bacon's married life was clouded at its close; nor did he himself realize the love pictured in the Plays; what wonder that he should then declare, that "the stage was more beholden to love, than the life of man."

In his youth Bacon described love as "the noblest affection of the mind." "Love is a pure gain and advancement in nature; it is not a good by comparison, but a true good; it is not an ease of pain, but a true purchase of pleasures; and therefore when our minds are soundest, when they are not as it were in sickness and therefore out of taste; but when we be in prosperity, when we want nothing, then is the season, and the opportunity, and the spring of love. And as it springeth not out of ill, so is it not intermixed with ill; it is not like the virtues, which by a steep and ragged way conduct us to a plain, and are hard task-masters at first, and after give an honourable hire; but the first aspect of love and all that followeth is gracious and pleasant."*

Contrast with Bacon's life the life of William Shakespeare. His love is said to be ardent and passionate, but it was lawless and impure.

He seduced the woman who became his wife, and in

* "Conference of Pleasure."

a few years deserted her, and ignored the marriage tie. His manner of life in London is illustrated by the licentious trick played on his fellow-player Burbage. Unless belied by common report, he seduced the wife of his host at the Crown Inn, Oxford; and Davenant, the reputed child of this amour, boasted of his irregular parentage; and, though Shakespeare returned to Stratford a man of some wealth, he left his daughter in ignorance, and, dying of a drunken bout, bequeathed his second best bed to his wife, as the sole requital for his neglect.

These are plain facts, and very little more is really known of Shakespeare.

Which of these two men was the Idealist of pure womanhood? Is temperance or sensuality the source of such noble imaginations?

The Plays denounce in scathing terms ignorance, intemperance, and vice, "Oh thou monster ignorance, how deformed dost thou look."* "To be now a sensible man, by and by a fool, and presently a beast, O strange."† "Oh you beast! Oh faithless coward! Oh dishonest wretch! Wilt thou be made a man out of my vice?"‡

Is this from the mouth of William Shakespeare or of Francis Bacon? Which is the fount from which flow such pure imagination, such indignation against ignorance and vice?

But it is said, and Tennyson so thought, that Bacon's Essay of *Love* is inconsistent with his authorship of the Plays.

On the contrary, the Plays, as Mr. R. M. Theobald has well shewn§, anticipate, in varied detail, the philosophy of love presented in the Essay.

"They do best," the Essay says, "who, if they cannot

* *Love's Labour's Lost.* † *Othello.* ‡ *Measure for Measure.*
§ "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light."

but admit love, yet make it keep quarters, and sever it wholly from their serious affairs and actions of life. For if it checke once with businesse, it troubleth men's fortunes, and makes men that they can noways be true to their own ends." "Great spirits and great business do keep out this weak passion." "It is a strange thing to note the excess of this passion, and how it braves the nature and value of things by this, that the speaking in a perpetual hyperbole is comely in nothing but in Love." "He that preferred Helena quitted the gifts of Juno and Pallas, for whosoever esteemeth too much of amourous affection quitteth both riches and wisdom." "*Amare et sapere vix Deo conceditur.*" "In life it does much mischief, sometimes like a syren, sometimes like a fury."

This is one view, the philosophic view of love, yet it is one illustrated throughout the Plays.

In only a few of the Plays is love the chief motive. Twice the Plays repeat that to be wise and love is for the Gods.

Hamlet and Hotspur, Brutus, Julius Cæsar and Coriolanus keep down this passion, and sever it wholly from their serious affairs. Troilus and Romeo, the King of Navarre and his courtiers, exhibit the hyperbole of love. Valentine and Proteus discourse how they are befooled by the weak passion. Benedick wonders "that one man seeing how much another man is a fool when he dedicates his behaviour to love, will, after that he hath laughed at such shallow follies in others, become the argument of his own scorn by falling in love." Cleopatra shews the syren power of love; Othello and Hamlet its fury when "transported to the mad degree."

This philosophy of love pervades the Plays, but illumined by such tender scenes as are found in the *Tempest*, the *Merchant of Venice*, and *Romeo and Juliet*. Where do the sordid facts of Shakespeare's life reflect such wisdom or such tenderness?

After a digression, perhaps of more eloquence than argument, about Perdita and her flowers, the argument is resumed with the Play of *Henry IV.;* and although it is allowed that Bacon possessed "a subdued and refined humour," it is declared that, for lack of wit, the coupling of Bacon and Falstaff is "as unthinkable as Bacon and Perdita, or Bacon and Juliet."

The argument of lack of wit seems fragile! One character of Bacon's extraordinary genius was its versatility, another was its wit. Wit so super-abounding that it became a snare. "His language," Ben Jonson says, "*when he could spare or pass by a jest* was nobly censorious." He begged Sir Tobie Matthew, his "kind inquisitor," to whose criticism he submitted his writings, to mark any passages where he had allowed his wit too free scope. Macaulay said that in wit Bacon "never had an equal; occasionally it obtained the mastery over all his other faculties, and led him into absurdities into which no dull man could have fallen." And Macaulay declared Bacon's Apothegms to be "the best collection of jests in the world."

As for versatility Bacon took all knowledge for his province. "I have heard him," Francis Osborne wrote, "entertain a country lord in the proper terms relating to hawks and dogs; and at another time outcant a London chirurgeon." He was, Sir Tobie Matthew wrote, "a creature of incomparable abilities of mind, of a sharp and catching apprehension, large and faithful memory, plentiful and sprouting invention, deep and solid judgment, for as much as might concern the understanding part. A man so rare in knowledge of so many several kinds, endued with the facility and felicity of expressing it all, in so elegant, significant, so abundant, and yet so choice and ravishing a way, of words, of metaphors, and allusions, as, perhaps, the world hath not seen, since it was a world."

Coleridge said that Shakespeare was a philosophical poet, and Bacon a poetical philosopher. Are these not the two sides of the gold and silver shield?

The sole examples extant of Shakespeare's wit and versatility are the lampoon on Sir Thomas Lucy, and the epitaph on John Coombe the usurer.

Finally, the article declares that "Honour in its higher senses was as foreign to Bacon's thoughts as to his practice!" But such depreciation of Francis Bacon is as imaginary, as is the exaltation of William Shakespeare. Spedding and Hepworth Dixon long since vindicated Bacon's memory from such charges.

Of William Shakespeare no honourable action is recorded. Contrast there is indeed! Judge on which side the balance falls.

GEORGE C. BOMPAS.

"HIGH behaviour is as rare in fiction as it is in fact. Scott is praised for the fidelity with which he painted the demeanour and conversation of the superior classes. Certainly kings and queens, nobles and great ladies, had some right to complain of the absurdity that had been put in their mouths before the days of *Waverley;* but neither does Scott's dialogue bear criticism. His lords brave each other in smart epigrammatic speeches, but the dialogue is in costume, and does not please on the second reading: it is not warm with life. In Shakespeare alone the speakers do not strut and bridle, the dialogue is easily great, and he adds to so many titles that of being the best bred man in England and in Christendom."—*Emerson.*

FRANCIS BACON THE STATESMAN: ILLUSTRATIONS OF HIS METHODS OF WORKING.—I.

OF all men who have exercised a vast influence over mankind, probably no one has been so misrepresented and so misunderstood as Francis Bacon. His biographers differ widely in their estimates of his character, ranging from fierce invective to boundless eulogy, and one is moved to ask, why this is so? Whether there is any reasonable explanation to this strange anomaly? This we desire to examine and add our mite towards a solution of the difficulty, a problem of deep interest, and of the utmost fascination.

In the first place the majority of his biographers have practically ignored considerable periods of his life, and consequently have given partial, one-sided views. It is imperatively necessary to insist on his position as a great Parliamentarian. At the age of 24 he was elected by the Borough of Melcombe in 1585, sitting with Hatton, Egerton, Sidney, and Raleigh; and as Hepworth Dixon forcefully says:—"Yet from the ranks of this group he leaps like fire into fame; Burke's spring was not so high, Pitt's popularity not so wide." In 1586 he was elected for Taunton; in 1589 he sat for Liverpool. In 1593 he was returned for the first constituency of the county—Middlesex. In 1597 for Ipswich; and in 1601 he has a double return for Ipswich and St. Albans. After representing Ipswich for thirteen years, he is returned for three constituences—Ipswich, St. Albans, and Cambridge, he deciding to sit for the latter as the University of his early training. As to his unrivalled powers of oratory, Archbishop Tennison thought it no strained compliment to say:—"That it was well for Cicero and the honour of his orations, that Bacon composed his in another language." As is well known, Ben Jonson

wrote of Bacon that "His hearers could not cough or look aside without loss; that he commanded where he spoke, and had his judges angry and pleased at his devotion; that the fear of every man who heard him was, that he should make an end."

This is a slight digression but a needful one, as this side of his life has been largely ignored, and we shall need it later in our argument. It is also necessary to refer to another fact, without a clear realisation of which, no solution is possible, that is, Francis Bacon lived a secret life, so separate that even his mother, one of the most learned women of the age, to whom he was devotedly attached, and whom he regarded as a "saint of God," was utterly unable to understand him or comprehend his doings; and if he was thus strange and mysterious to his own flesh and blood, how much more so to others with whom he mixed. The truth was, his life was largely lived in deep meditation, in revolving great schemes of reform, and, as it were, subtily working underground; for he found the men in power, whose help he needed, were hard to sway to his purposes. The Cecils, both father and son, were like adamant; the Queen, as hard to move, refused him repeatedly the positions he craved at her hands, and he early came to the belief, as conclusive to him as an axiom, that it was hard, barren work attacking abuses in front, and directly, that they were rendered impregnable by the ignorance and prejudices of men, and consequently the only effective way was by imitating the ancient sages, who partly concealed their teaching and message in myth and fable; and so Bacon in his preface to his work on the "*Wisdom of the Ancients*," indicates his own method and intentions by saying:—

"And even in this day, if any man would let in new light upon the human understanding; and conquer prejudice, without raising contests, animosities, or

disturbances, he must still go on in the same path, and have recourse to the like method of allegory, metaphor, and allusion."

With this introduction we will pass to an illustration of Bacon's methods, and as an example, we believe never before referred to, will consider his action in respect to the Bill of Union brought in, in 1606, together with his method of dealing with the John Bates agitation in contradistinction with Sir Thomas Fleming's fiasco. Bacon has been slighted by the Government, others have been preferred to offices that he has long sought. Sir Thomas Fleming has been made Solicitor-General, and when he becomes Chief Baron of the Exchequer in 1604, Bacon is again passed over; the vacant office is given to Sir John Dodderidge, and Sir Henry Hobart is raised over Bacon's head to the coveted place of Attorney-General. The Bill of Union of England and Scotland is before the House, upon which the King has set his heart, but the time is not favourable. The Scots in London are extremely unpopular, and are mocked and jeered at on the stage, to the annoyance and deep resentment of the King. Three of the most noted dramatists of the time—Ben Jonson, George Chapman, and John Marston—are committed to prison for insulting references to the Scots. The Government is alarmed, public feeling is deeply stirred, and the position is serious. As Hallam writes:—"James had imposed a duty of five shillings per hundredweight on currants, above that of two shillings and sixpence, which was granted by the statute of tonnage and poundage. John Bates, a Turkey merchant, having refused payment, an information was exhibited against him in the Exchequer. Judgment was soon given for the Crown. The speeches of Chief Baron Fleming and of Baron Clark, contain propositions still worse than their decision, and wholly subversive of liberty." The unjust

condemnation of Bates has aroused the country, and from every seaport come protests against the straining of the King's prerogative, and Sir Thomas Fleming's interpretation of the law. Under these adverse conditions the prospects of the Bill of Union look very black. The Government needing additional debating power, appeal to Bacon, and offer him the place of Solicitor-General in return for his support. The Bill drawn up by Egerton is before the House; Nicholas Fuller, Member for London, voicing the popular will, and especially that of his constituents, opposes the Bill in an impressive speech, the more captivating as it appeals to the national prejudices and antipathies of his hearers. He contrasts the prosperity, pastures, fisheries, mines, commerce of England with that of the barren, rocky land north of the Tweed, and maintains that it is best for England to remain apart, and sits down, having largely carried the House with him.

The prospects of the Bill look blacker still, but Bacon replies, and lifts the debate to a loftier ground, and seeking to eliminate passion and prejudice, examines the objections with his cold, clear light, and unanswerable logic; he maintains that England is not overpopulated, adducing as a proof, that if it were, we should not be relinquishing such a wealth of fishing to the Flemings, as is known we do. That the Scots are a hardy, warlike people. Take away the brand of aliens, and they will stand by our side against the world. That Scotland had been the postern gate by which the French could annoy us, as likewise Ireland had been the opportunity for Spain. Pass the Bill and you close our gates against the enemy. You object that the Scots are poor, but are not strong limbs and a hardy race better to defend an empire than riches? Rome had a poor, a pastoral beginning. Did not the Swiss, bred in a mountainous country, first ruin the

Duke of Burgundy? England united with Scotland would be one of the greatest Monarchies of the world.

This is a rough summary of his speech for the union of the two countries in the House; but where is his deeper, more subtle, more powerful advocacy? Where is the fulfilment of his solemnly avowed method of working that:—

"Even in this day if any man would let in new light and conquer prejudice, without raising contests, animosities, oppositions, and disturbances, he must still go on in the same path, and have recourse to the like method of allegory, metaphor, and allusion"?

As assuredly found in the Play of *Henry V.*, as his open advocacy was made in the House of Commons. In defiance of popular sentiment, he inoculates the piece with the lesson of brotherhood of unity, and lets it work out unseen, unsuspected, unrecognised, his great purposes. He pictures the four captains, introducing them as representing the union of England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland, under the names of the English Gower, the Welsh Fluellen, the Scotch Jamy, and the Irish MacMorris. He pictures them discussing a tactical question, all captains in an united army opposing a foreign foe. We see the broad-minded statesman and philosopher striving to break down mean, petty, national antipathy, and infuse a spirit of broad brotherhood, by figuring the cowardly bully Pistol, held up to scorn by the gallant Englishman, Gower, and justly chastised by the brave Welshman, Fluellen, whom he had insulted, and made to eat the leek to the approval of Gower; a pointed lesson to those who scoffed at our gallant confreres in the approaching union. It is to be noted that while Gower, Jamy, and Fluellen are in hearty accord, representing England, Scotland, and Wales meeting on equal footing, the

philosophic statesman pointedly illustrates in the hasty, irritable, irreconcilable MacMorris that his spirit is wounded, by his nation not being on the same footing, and we see foreshadowed the spirit of Gladstone three hundred years later, and also in the appreciative bending of the King to the true-hearted Welshman; as *Fluellen* says:—

"I am your Majesty's countryman, I care not who knows it: I will confess it to the 'orld. I need not be ashamed of your Majesty, so long as your Majesty is an honest man."

King: "God keep me so."

Now, in the face of the bitter feeling against the Scots, it must be quite obvious that the Scotch Jamy was introduced into the Play in defiance of a strong national prejudice, and it may fairly be asked: Is it within the region of common sense, that if the Play was written by an actor-manager simply desirous of pleasing his patrons, and increasing the financial result, would he have thus pictured the union in face of the intensely antagonistic popular feeling? No! It was a parable to a great political end, and by one who desired the coming of the golden age of brotherhood, who foresaw with prophetic eye the possibilities for his country in the future, and who, hiding himself, worked unknown, unhonoured, and unsung, for the relief of man's estate; if it were not so, what could be the meaning of his prayer, when in the hours of his humiliation and fall, while confessing his "manifold transgressions," he appealed to the Great Searcher of all hearts, that he had hated all cruelty and hardness of heart; "I have (though in a despised weed) procured the good of all men." What was this despised disguise, under which he had shrouded himself, and worked for all humanity, if it were not the Plays?

Again, if Shakespeare was the real author, as he was the reputed one, why does he in Sonnet 76 write thus :—

"Why write I still all one, ever the same,
And keep invention in a noted weed,
That every word doth almost tell my name,
Showing their birth, and where they did proceed?"

Where would be the sense or reason in the reputed author, Shakespeare, writing these words :—

"That every word doth almost tell my name,
Showing their birth, and where they did proceed?"

But as Bacon it is clear, relevant, and logical, for the "despised weed," or the "noted weed," was the disguise in which he cloaked himself to let in new light, without raising prejudices and animosities.

We have alluded to the unjust judgment against John Bates in the Court of the Exchequer, and quoted "*Hallam's Condemnation of Sir Thomas Fleming's Reading of the Law*" (the same Fleming that had been promoted over Bacon's head to the Solicitorship) ; and also referred to the intense feeling of the aroused country over the illegal straining of the King's prerogative. James, to make matters worse, had made a most haughty speech, and as Hallam says, "alluded with peculiar acrimony to certain speeches made in the House, wherein probably his own fame had not been spared."

"I looked," he says, "for no such fruits at your hands, such personal discourses and speeches, which of all other, I looked you should avoid, as not beseeming the gravity of your assembly. I am your King ; I am placed to govern you, and shall answer for your errors ; I am a man of flesh and blood, and have my passions and affections as other men ; I pray you do not too far move me to do that, which my power may tempt me unto" ("*Commons Journal*," 366).

Again Bacon strives to make peace, he tries to soothe the King with the extreme limit of prerogative the law will allow. As Hallam writes: "It may be observed that the high-flying creed of prerogative mingled itself intimately with the question of naturalization, which was argued on the monarchical principle of personal allegiance to the sovereign, as opposed to the halt republican theory that lurked in the contrary proposition."

"Allegiance," says Lord Bacon, "is of greater extent and dimension than laws or kingdoms, it continueth after laws, and it is in vigour when laws are suspended and have not had their force." So Lord Coke: "Whatsoever is due by the law or constitution of man may be altered, but natural legiance or obedience of the subject to the sovereign can not be altered; *ergo*, natural allegiance or obedience to the sovereign is not due by the law or the constitution of man."

But this pronouncement, by two of the greatest exponents of English law, does not satisfy or quiet the popular mind, and so the patient philosopher and statesman introduces John Bates, the Turkey merchant, into the Play of *Henry V.*, with Alexander Court and Michael Williams; they are pictured as dissatisfied, and somewhat disloyal. The King, disguised, converses with them, and discusses the position of the King's responsibility, as compared with the private soldier or individual. Bacon puts into the King's mouth the leading sentiments of King James' speech in the House, so much objected to and criticised, but eliminates the haughtiness, and indirectly schools James, and teaches kings generally the power of gracious courtesy in winning the hearts of their subjects. King James had said in his absurd speech to both Houses, threatening them with his displeasure:—

"I am a man of flesh and blood, and have my

passions and affections as other men ; I pray you do not too far move me to do that, which my power may tempt me unto."

But Bacon softens the words in the mouth of the disguised King Henry V., thus :—

"I think the King is but a man as I am, the violet smells to him as it doth to me, all his senses have but human conditions ; his ceremonies laid by, in his nakedness he appears but a man ; and though his affections are higher mounted than ours, yet when they stoop, they stoop with the like wing," etc.

Without staying to emphasise that the smell of the violet was the oft-mentioned ideal perfume in Bacon's opinion, it is to be noted also, that Bacon puts into the King's mouth the argument most likely to appeal to, and weigh with the dissatisfied and somewhat disloyal Bates ; as John Bates was a merchant, the disguised King says :—

"So if a son, that is by his father sent about merchandise, do sinfully miscarry upon the sea, the imputation of his wickedness, by your rule, should be imposed upon his father who sent him."

The entire argument is too long to quote, but it wins Bates over to the King's views and dispels the dissatisfaction and disloyalty, thus :—

Bates : "I do not desire he should answer for me, and yet I determine to fight lustily for him."

Attention may be called to the fact that Bacon puts into the mouth of John Bates, of all men in the Play, a reproof to Englishmen at debate and variance among themselves, especially to King James himself, for on the eve of the great battle, Bates says to Williams and the disguised King, who were wrangling :—

Bates: "Be friends, you English fools, be friends; we have French quarrels enow, if you knew how to reckon."

One great aim of Bacon was to reconcile the would-be despotic King and people; he could see the first signs of the approaching tempest, that was, later in the next reign to deluge England with blood; and he sought to moderate the despotic pretensions of the King, and infuse into his mind a more gracious manner and bearing to his subjects, seeking also to divert the mind of James from the exercise of that kingcraft which embittered his relations with his people, and which, continued by his son Charles, brought him to the scaffold. The introduction of John Bates, (the John Hampden of the first of the Stuarts), into the Play, the gracious condescension of the disguised king, winning the dissatisfied, half-disloyal man to his side, is simply one lesson out of thousands by this great teacher of men. The creation of the four captains—English, Scotch, Welsh, and Irish, is but another; and though wrought for the exigencies of the time, is still sound in principle and lastingly true.

Very noteworthy is it that the Scotch Jamy, and Irish MacMorris are not mentioned in the early Quarto, and unquestionably were added to the Play a few years later, when the matter of the union of the two countries was so prominently brought before the nation; and who would be so likely to show the better way to deal with the sturdy Scots, and the equally sturdy John Bates, as Francis Bacon, especially as Sir Thomas Fleming's bad reading of the law had made Bates a rallying point for the nation; and we can well understand Bacon placing in vivid contrast his own gentle method of dealing with Bates, with the tremendous fiasco of his rival Fleming.

With this definite evidence we have adduced in favour of Bacon's authorship, we will contrast the shadowy, phantom-like Shakesperian claims. Listen to the

careful and judicial Hallam, whose reliability is universally acknowledged, and with it we close :—

"All that insatiable curiosity and unwearied diligence, has hitherto detected about Shakespeare, serves rather to disappoint and perplex us, than to furnish the slightest illustration of his character. It is not the register of his baptism, with the draft of his will, or the orthography of his name, we seek. No letter of his writing, no record of his conversation, no character of him drawn with any fulness by a contemporary, has ever been produced."

GEORGE JAMES.

BACON, SHAKESPEARE, AND DR. MURRAY.

[Inspired by a recently issued number of the "*New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*," a paragraph has been making the round of the daily and weekly papers to the effect that "Another argument against the Bacon-Shakespeare theory is supplied by Dr. Murray. Shakespeare uses 54 verbs, beginning with *out*, such as *outshoot*, and is our first authority for 38 of them, whilst Bacon only uses 2." Instead, however, of being, as alleged, "another nail in the Baconian coffin," the truth proves on the contrary to be somewhat of a barb in the side of Dr. Murray. If Mr. Stronach is able, with so little trouble, to place his finger upon so many errors, it is disquieting to contemplate how great a number probably exist undetected, and how untrustworthy the work of Dr. Murray and his large corps of assistants threatens to prove.

The following letter appeared (in abridged form) in *The Academy and Literature*. It was previously declined by the editors of *The Athenæum* and *The Literary World*. No reply to the letter has been made by Dr. Murray.—ED.]

SIR,—In your article, "Diversions in O," it is stated that Dr. Murray notes in the "New English Dictionary" that "'out'-verbs . . . were much favoured by Shakespeare, but were almost eschewed by Bacon. . . . In Bacon only two have

been found"—one of these being "out-shoot," which he maintains had been in common use for over seventy years. According to Dr. Murray's own statement, "out"-verbs were "apparently eschewed," not "almost eschewed," by Bacon, and "while Shakespeare *uses* fifty-four of these verbs . . . we *cite* Bacon only for two." *The Spectator* adds — "This is a significant instance of the value of this great work." "Dr. Murray," as you say, "throws a pebble in the troubled Shakespeare-Bacon pool." It is only a "pebble," and won't make a big splash in the water.

Now "using" or "finding" the use of a word is one thing and "citing" its use is another. In the "New English Dictionary" I have found that invariably for the historical use of a word—even of common words like "change" and "changed"—Dr. Murray adopts Shakespeare in preference to any other author, even when a better and earlier or even a contemporaneous use could be "cited" from Bacon. In fact, Dr. Murray "eschews" Bacon, confining his attention to the "Advancement of Learning," "Essays," "Henry VII.," "Sylva Sylvarum," and "Colours of Good and Evil."

For example, to give an historical use of the verb "to countenance," Dr. Murray "cites" Shakespeare in 2 *Henry IV.* (1597) with the words "to countenance William Visor of Wincot." Now this is a favourite word with Bacon, and a prior and equally good reference, I contend, might have been made to a letter written by Bacon to the Queen in 1593: "Your Majesty has been gracious to me both in countenancing me . . ." (Spedding's "Letters and Life," I., 240).

Then, again, with the word "impediment," often used by Bacon, Dr. Murray's reference is, of course, to Shakespeare, *Richard III.* (1594), although in 1593 Bacon uses the word in a letter to Cecil. (Spedding, I., 237).

Another pet word with Bacon, used over and over again in his "Works" and "Letters," and only four times by Shakespeare, is "advertisement." For this word Dr. Murray "cites" Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing* (produced [?] 1599, published 1600), although Bacon employs the word in a letter to Essex in 1593. Then there is the word "disloyalty," used twice by Shakespeare and many times by Bacon. For his historical use Dr. Murray "cites" Shakespeare's *Much Ado* (1599-1600), and fails to "cite" the use of the word by Bacon in his "Advice to Essex" in March 1599 (IV., 287). Frequently in connection with Essex's rebellion, we find Bacon using the verb "barricado" in 1601, but in the same year Shakespeare uses the word in *All's Well*, and this use is credited to him as being the first use in English literature. Then there is the word "fumble,' which Shakespeare uses four times, and is "cited" by Dr. Murray for three different uses. Bacon uses the word in his "History of Life and Death," but Bacon is not "cited." Shakespeare uses "blab" three times, and is "cited" twice by Dr. Murray. Bacon uses the word in the same sense more than once in his "Letters" (Spedding VI., 114), but is not "cited." The Dictionary gives no use of the word "brigue" between 1496 and 1678, but Bacon uses it in 1613 (Spedding, IV., 372). And so also with words like "coagulation" (IV., 72), "inconveniences" (used over and over again by Bacon, but, of course, *not* "cited," although Shakespeare, who uses the word twice only, *is* "cited"), "bates" (II., 163), "counterfeit" (II., 20), "commodities" (I., 159), to "gravel" (I., 362), "goods and chattels," "curds," &c.—Shakespeare is "cited" for their use, not Bacon. I think, therefore, I have made it clear that the non-citation of a word by Dr. Murray does not prove the non-usage of that word by Bacon.

But in many cases I have found Dr. Murray refusing Bacon credit for the first use of a word. One of these is "*barricado*," already instanced. Another is the noun "*buzz*," defined by Dr. Murray as (1) "A condition of busy activity, stir, ferment," or (2) "A busy rumour." In the former sense, Dr. Murray's example of the first use is taken from Feltham's "Resolves" (1627), and in the latter sense from Shakespeare's *King Lear* (1605). But the word is frequently used by Bacon in his "Letters," as early as 1601, where we read "to make the more *buzz* of the danger he stood in." (Spedding, II., 268, and also V. 40 and 43, and Essay XXXI). Again, in the sense of "a sibilant hum, such as is made by bees, flies, and other winged insects," according to Dr. Murray, the first use of "buzz" is found in 1645 in Milton's pamphlet, "*Colasterion*." Will it surprise him to find that in 1619 Bacon writes to Buckingham, "Be they flies, or be they wasps, I neither care for buzzes nor stings" (Spedding, VII. 81)? The first use of "*affrontedly*" is given as 1656, although Bacon writes in 1616 "most *affrontedly*" (Spedding, V. 363). The first use of "beforehand" is given as 1595 (*King John*), but Bacon uses the word in 1594 (Spedding, I. 353). The first use of "answerable to" (meaning "commensurate with") is ascribed to 1617, though Bacon uses the expression in 1593 (Spedding, I. 264) and in 1599-1600 twice (II. 181). In the same letter (1593) there is the word "entireness," of which Dr. Murray could not find a use till 1599, Bacon being only credited with the *second* use in 1605 ("Advancement of Learning"). Then, again, Dr. Murray cannot find a use for "dividedly" till 1607, although Bacon uses the word in 1594 (I. 324); his first use of "breathing-time" is in 1599, although Bacon uses it in 1595 (II. 16); his first use of "deboshed" is also 1599, although Bacon uses it in 1595 (II. 16). The word "huddler" is so "rare,"

according to Dr. Murray, that he can "cite" only one use of it in the English language, by Cotgrave in 1611; but if Spedding had been consulted he would have found that Bacon applies the word to Coke in a letter to Essex in 1593 (I. 262). And so on with many other words.

But, strangest of all, when Bacon *is* generously accorded and "cited" for the first use of a word, I can find instances of a prior use of the word by Bacon himself, anterior in date to that given in the Dictionary. For instance, the first use of the expression "In competition with" given in the Dictionary is ascribed to Bacon in the "Advancement of Learning" (1605), but in a letter of Bacon's to Sir Thomas Egerton, dated 1597 (Spedding, II., 63), he writes: "I see no man ripened for the place of Master of the Rolls *in competition with* Mr. Attorney-General." And again, the first use of the word "concurrence" (common with Bacon) is also attributed to the "Advancement of Learning" (1605), although Bacon uses the word in 1594 (I. 333), and in 1597 Bacon said, in a "Speech on the Subsidy:" "So this *concurrence* of occurrents . . ." (Spedding, II. 88).

My contention is that Bacon has not received the same attention as Shakespeare at the hands of Dr. Murray, possibly because there is a Shakespeare "Concordance," which can be more readily consulted than the fourteen volumes of Spedding's "Works" and "Letters" of Bacon for any use of a word, of which works there is no similar "Concordance," although I am glad to know that Mrs. Pott has been for long engaged on what will prove a very useful and interesting volume. From the "Works" of Bacon, we are supplied with the first uses of words in the language, such as "application" (in the sense of "self-adaptation") "adventive" used twice in English

literature, and both times by Bacon), "allusive," "axiom" (meaning "empirical law"), and "athletic" ("art of activity"). But there are first uses of words in the "Letters" which are not "cited" in the Dictionary. Why? Because the "Letters" were never consulted for such a use. Here is a specimen. The first use of "aggregative," is ascribed by Dr. Murray to Jessop, who uses the word as an *adjective*, in 1644, but if he turns to Spedding, IV., 54, he will find the word "aggregative" used by Bacon in 1608 as a *noun*—"3 pilles of aggregative." Dr. Murray "cites" no use of the word as a *noun* although he has a "quasi substantive," an equivalent to "aggregate" (1792). Here is a new noun actually coined by Bacon, and not "cited" in the Dictionary. Had it been found in the Shakespeare "Concordance" it would have been "cited" right enough, I have not the smallest doubt.

There is another word, "fore-rank," for the use of which *as a noun* Dr. Murray cites Shakespeare. He can apparently find not a single use of it *as a verb*, although in 1615 Bacon wrote: "Wherein his Majesty did fore-rank and make it his prime direction" (V. 217).

Again, when Dr. Murray sometimes manages to hit upon the first use of a word by Bacon, he may give the quotation; but, in one instance at least, he assigns a wrong date to the extract. Take "curiality," for instance. The first known example of this word is taken from Bacon's "Advice to Villiers," ascribed to the year *1626*, although this "Advice" had been imparted to Villiers in *1616*—only ten years previously! (Spedding, VI. 52).

As to the "out"-verbs, the only two cited by Dr. Murray from Bacon are "outshoot" and "out-compass," which appear in the Dictionary, as neither word is to be found in the Shakespeare "Concordance," and so well known are they that Richardson's,

the "Encyclopædic," the "Century" (latter with "outcompass"), and other Dictionaries, give their sole illustrations of the use of these two words from Bacon's "Essays" and "The Advancement of Learning." If "outshoot," as Dr. Murray says, "had been in common use for seventy years," it is curious that it is not found in Shakespeare. Perhaps it was too "common" for the great intellect which could coin words by the dozen.

But what about the "out"-verbs in Bacon *not* cited by Dr. Murray? He can find them if he tries. For these other "out"-verbs used by Bacon, Shakespeare is "cited," but Bacon is not. Why? Because Bacon's "Letters" (published 1861-74) were ignored in the compilation of the "New English Dictionary." Take the verb "out-face," for example, for the use of which word Shakespeare is "cited" four times by Dr. Murray—twice for the same meaning of the word—2 *Henry VI.* (1593), *Merchant of Venice* (1596), 1 *Henry IV.* (1596), and *King Lear* (1605). Even Nathaniel Bacon is "cited," 1649; but Francis Bacon in 1601 (Spedding, II., 225) writes: "Outface it with impudency." Of course he is not "cited" for the use of this "out"-verb. The necessity of "citing" Shakespeare twice, in 1593 and 1596, for the use of a word with a similar signification, is not very apparent. Would the use of the word by Bacon in 1601, instead of the second example by Bacon in 1596 (only three years after the first), not have been an improvement in an "historical" Dictionary? Then, the "out"-verb "outlawed" is only used once by Shakespeare, but is common in Bacon ("Works," Vol. VII., and "Henry VII." *passim*). In the next Division of the Dictionary—the new section of which only goes the length of "Outing"—I expect to find Shakespeare, not Bacon, "cited" for the use of "outlawed." And so with "outstrip" (used thrice by

Shakespeare) and at least twice by Bacon ("Works," IV., 230; "Letters," IV., 100). Will Bacon be "cited" for "outstrip?" Then there is "outcast," used thrice by Shakespeare, and "cited," of course, by Dr. Murray, from the "Sonnets" (ascribed to 1600, but first published in 1609). Dr. Murray could not get an historical use of this "out"-verb "outcast" between 1600 and Southey's use of the word in 1795, but we have two intermediate uses of it by Bacon in 1612 (Spedding, IV., 268) and in 1623 (Spedding, VII., 549). Then we have an "out-weigh" in the "Works," V., 6, an "out-run" in the "Works," IV., 184, and numberless nouns and adjectives compounded with "out," one of them "outlet" ("Essay," XV.) not to be found in Shakespeare! Among these words are "outline," "outrage," "outset," "outward," "outworks," &c.

It seems to me, it may not to Dr. Murray, an extraordinary circumstance that more *first* uses and *only* uses of certain words in the English language can be drawn from the writings of Shakespeare and Bacon, two men who lived contemporaneously with each other, were not acquainted with each other (we are informed), and never referred to each other, than from any dozen other authors combined. Take the verb "barricado," the first use of which is, as I have said, by Bacon and Shakespeare in the very same year, 1601, and the word "dexteriously" used for the first time in *Twelfth Night* (1601) (first printed in 1623), used by Bacon in the "Advancement of Learning" (written 1603, printed 1605), and not used again till 1635—a curious history. If Shakespeare invented the word, Bacon must have borrowed it from *Twelfth Night* (the stage MS. version or the performance), as he had no printed copy available till 1623.

Recently Judge Willis maintained: "I do not believe that either the author of the Folio, 1623, or Lord

Bacon, added a new word to the English tongue, or used for the first time an old word with a new meaning." Why, we have hundreds of such additions and first uses in Shakespeare and Bacon—newly coined words and new meanings being used by the two writers, or one or other of them, and used by no others, practically at the same time.

Who was the more likely etymologist, I would ask Dr. Murray—for it is a question of etymology—Emerson's "man of Stratford," who left school at the age of thirteen or fourteen and at once became a butcher's apprentice, whose father and mother could not write, and who left his "bookless" native town without an education in English (as English, except the A.B.C. per the horn-book, formed no part of any Grammar School curriculum in the days of Elizabeth), but with a vocabulary, according to Max Müller and Stopford Brooke, of 15,000 pure English words, many of them used for the first time according to Dr. Murray—a vocabulary twice as large as the scholarly Milton's; or the great philosopher and English scholar, carefully educated, whose father was Lord-keeper and whose mother was governess to Edward VI., and spoke and wrote English, Latin, Greek, Italian, and French "as her native tongue," the man who had left Cambridge, at the age of 15, as there was nothing more they could teach him, the genius who in his youth declared, "I have taken all knowledge to be my province?" (Spedding, I., 109).

This is apart from the subject; but in conclusion I would suggest that, although the "New English Dictionary" is far advanced, it would be to its advantage, for citations of the first and other uses of English words in the forthcoming sections, if Dr. Murray would set his readers upon Spedding's "Letters and Life of Bacon." Unless this is done, Dr. Murray

must alter his Preface, in which he says that his "quotations range from the first-known occurrence of the word to the latest."

Yours, &c.,

GEORGE STRONACH.

Edinburgh.

THE FOLIO ADDITIONS.

IN a little sixpenny pamphlet, which should be in the hands of all Baconians, entitled, "Bacon-Shakespeare Discussion," written by Mr. C. Y. C. Dawbarn, M.A., and published by Messrs. Young and Sons, Liverpool, a fact is resuscitated which will require some ingenuity on the part of Shakespereans to explain.

In the Quarto editions of 2 *Henry VI.* (1st Part of the *Contention*) of 1594 and 1619, Lord Saye, who had been seized by Jack Cade, pleads for his life in the following four lines:—

> "Kent, in the 'Commentaries' Cæsar wrote,
> Term'd it the civil'st place of all this land.
> Then, noble countrymen, hear me but speak:
> I sold not France, I lost not Normandy."

Between 1619 and 1623 occurred the fall of Bacon (1621), and in the Folio of 1623 these four lines were thus amplified:—

> "Kent, in the 'Commentaries' Cæsar writ,
> Is termed the civil'st place in all this isle.
> Sweet is the country, because full of riches,
> The people liberal, valiant, active, wealthy,
> Which makes me hope you are not void of pity.
> I sold not Maine, I lost not Normandy,
> Yet to recover them would lose my life.

Justice with favour have I always done;
Prayers and tears have moved me, gifts could never.
When have I aught enacted from your hands
But to maintain the king, the realm, and you?
Large gifts have I bestowed on learned clerks,
Because my book preferred me to the king.
And seeing ignorance is the curse of God,
Knowledge, the wing wherewith we fly to heaven,
Unless you be possessed with devilish spirits,
You cannot but forbear to murder me."

Of this Mr. Dawbarn says: "Who was the writer in 1623 who thus improved on the Quarto of 1619? Whoever wrote this speech, one thing is undoubted, this is the way the events connected with Bacon's fall would have presented themselves to Bacon's mind. Whether we would agree, is another matter, but he would say: 'Justice I have always done; nought have I enacted; large gifts have I bestowed on learned clerks; my book has preferred me to my king; my life-work was to prove ignorance a curse, and knowledge the lamp to heaven.'"

We may add to this some evidence of the truth of Mr. Dawbarn's logical contention. What are Bacon's own words with regard to the charges brought against him? "*I was the justest judge that was in England these fifty years, but it was the justest censure that was in Parliament these 200 years.*"

"*I know I have clean hands and a clean heart; and I hope a clean house for friends or servants. But Job himself, or whosoever was the justest judge, by such hunting for matters against him as hath been used against me, may for a time seem foul.*"

"*I praise God for it, I never took money for any benefice or ecclesiastical living. I never took money for releasing anything I stopped at the Seal. I never took money for any commission, or things of that nature. I never shared with any reward for any second or inferior profit.*"

"*I take myself to be as innocent as any babe born on St. Innocent's Day, in my heart.*"

These passages form an excellent commentary on the two lines in italics (p. 164).

Then we have the two lines:—

> "Large gifts have I bestowed on learned clerks,
> Because my book preferred me to the king."

It is well known that Bacon employed a large staff of "clerks" in writing and translating his works, among them Ben Jonson, Hobbes, and Herbert. And what is the "book" referred to? May it not be the *Novum Organum*, dedicated to the king, acknowledgment of which was made by his Majesty in 1620, as follows: "*My Lord, I have received your letter and your book, than which you could not have sent a more acceptable present unto me. How thankful I am for it cannot better be expressed by me than a firm resolution I have taken: just to read it through with care and attention, though I should steal some hours from my sleep. . . . And so praying God to give your work as good success as your heart can wish and your labours deserve, I bid you heartily farewell.*"

These other two lines appear therefore to fit admirably into the life of Bacon with regard to the employment of "clerks" and the *Novum Organum* "preferring" him to the king.

Lord Saye says further:—

> "Prayers and tears have moved me, gifts could never."

We know how Bacon incurred the wrath of Coke and Buckingham by acceding to the prayers and tears of Lady Hatton to prevent the marriage of Frances Coke and Sir John Villiers. Bacon acknowledges he was influenced by "prayers and tears;" as for "gifts," he does not say he never took them, but that they never moved him.

There are still two other lines to be considered:—

"And seeing ignorance is the curse of God,
Knowledge, the wing wherewith we fly to heaven."

Are these lines not more likely to have been written by the scholar who declared in his youth, "I have taken all knowledge to be my province," than by the man who brought up his daughter in "the curse of God," inasmuch as she could not write her name?

The question remains—Who was it who wrote the additions to 2 *Henry VI.*, between 1619 and 1623? Shakespeare had been long dead. But Bacon was alive, and between the dates of his fall (1621) and his death (1626), Rawley, his chaplain, says in the *Resuscitatio*: "*The last five Years of his Life being withdrawn from Civil affairs, and from an active life, he employ'd wholly in contemplation and studies.*" Is it not possible a portion of his leisure was devoted to the revision of the Plays? For the Folio edition of *Richard III.*, the type of the 1622 Quarto edition had been kept standing; for in both versions are twelve similar printer's errors, and yet in the Folio edition there are 193 new lines and 2,000 re-touched. Then "who re-wrote for the Folio the 1619 Quarto edition of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, adding 900 lines; the 1622 version of *King John*, adding 1,000; and the 1622 version of *Othello*, adding 160?" (Dawbarn.) And all the additions were made not from an *actor's*, but from a *philosopher's* point of view, and the procedure of revision is exactly that shown by Bacon in the different editions of his Essays. After Shakspere's death the dramas were revised and added to, so were Bacon's works, while Bacon was alive. Rawley says: "His book of "*Instauratio Magna*" . . . I have seen at the least twelve copies, revised year by year one after another, and every year altered and amended in the frame thereof, till at last it came to that model in which it was committed to the Press, as many living creatures

do lick their young ones, till they bring them to their strength of Limbs." Bacon did this while he was alive. Could Shakspere accomplish a similar task when he was lying in his grave at Stratford—"seventeen feet deep?" (S. Lee, p. 273).

BACON AND ESSEX.

SOME time ago in a review of Stephen's "Selected State Trials" a critic in *The Literary World* wrote: "Macaulay, as everyone knows, makes a merciless attack on Bacon for his conduct at the trial of Essex. Bacon was Solicitor-General, and it was in that capacity that he appeared at the trial." This is somewhat new history, considering that Essex was tried and executed in 1601, and Bacon was not appointed Solicitor-General till 1607.

The critic, although Shakespearean, was fair enough to admit, with regard to Bacon, that "there is nothing in Howell or the Helmingham MS. to justify the strictures and the virulence of Macaulay," and that "Bacon's comparison of Essex with Pisistratus and the Duke of Guise, upon which he lays so much stress, was just the kind of erudite display to find favour with the times, and it is entirely in keeping with the classical comparisons and historical references to be found everywhere in Bacon's works."

This is a good "counteractive" to the spleen of Pope and Macaulay, from whom the past and present generations have taken their ideas of Francis Bacon.

Only the other day I read for the first time the article on "Bacon" by Mr. Sidney Lee in the last edition of "Chambers' Encyclopædia," and was amazed to find in it such statements as these:—"Bacon, *at his own request*, acted (in a subordinate capacity) with the prosecuting

counsel, in the hope, as he said, of aiding his patron." When did he say it? Those who know Elizabethan history—Mr. Lee has been lecturing on the subject in America—are aware that this statement is entirely devoid of foundation. After vainly endeavouring to persuade the Queen against the trial, Bacon desired to be excused from appearing in the case. Even Macaulay acknowledges:—"When Essex was brought before the Council to answer for his conduct in Ireland, Bacon, after a faint (?) attempt to excuse himself from taking part against his friend, submitted himself to the Queen's pleasure, and appeared at the Bar in support of the charges." He did appear at the Bar,—as one of the Queen's Counsel he could not help himself—and Essex was dismissed from all Offices of State, but, thanks to the strenuous efforts of Bacon with the Queen, the Earl saved his head, and was released. Then came the "Papist Insurrection," when Essex broke into open rebellion, thus neutralizing Bacon's efforts to reconcile the Queen and Essex. On this occasion, according to Mr. Sidney Lee, "Bacon *voluntarily* endeavoured to secure his conviction on the capital charge of treason." Mr. Lee is fond of "contemporary allusions" to *Shakespeare*. I would ask him to study the "contemporary allusions" to *Bacon* in the business of the trial and conviction of Essex. What is the truth in this matter? As Hepworth Dixon says:—"That the lofty and gentle course which Bacon pursued through these memorable events commanded the admiration of all his contemporaries save a fraction of the defeated band, is a fact of which the proofs are incontestable." Birch, in his "Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth," tells the story in this quaint fashion:—

"Mr. Francis Bacon . . . was told publicly by one of the councillors that her Majesty was not yet resolved whether she

would have him forborne in the business or not. This, he imagined, gave rise to a false report of his having solicited to be employed against the earl; whereas the truth was, that knowing what had passed between the queen and himself, and what occasion he had given her of distaste and distrust in crossing her disposition by standing firm for his lordship . . . he wrote to her Majesty two or three words of compliment, signifying to her, that if it would please her to spare him in that cause out of the consideration which she took of his obligations to the earl, *he should reckon it for one of her highest favours.* . . . A few days after Mr. Bacon and the rest of the Queen's Council were sent for again and told that her Majesty's pleasure was that they should have all parts in the business, in the distribution of which that allotted to Mr. Bacon *by the lords of the Council* was to set forth some undutiful carriage of the earl in giving occasion and contention to Dr. Heywarde's book, which was termed a seditious pamphlet. . . . Yet as it was the queen's pleasure to impose this task upon him, *he could not avoid it*, however reluctant."

If this is not sufficient to show that the prosecution of Essex—in which Bacon only played a very subordinate part—was not "voluntary," as Mr. Sidney Lee and others maintain it was, but was forced upon him by the Queen and the Privy Council, I would recommend them to read a letter on the subject from Bacon to Lord Henry Howard which appears in "The Dr. Farmer Chetham MS.," published by the Chetham Society in 1873. Here Bacon writes to Lord Henry Howard:—

"There is shaped a tale in a lewde forge that beates apace at this tyme, that I shold deliuer an opinion to the Queene in the Lo. of Essex Cause: ffirst that it was *premunire* and nowe last that it was heigh treason, and this opinion to be in opposition and encounter of the Cheefe Justices opineon and the Attornye Generall. My Lo, I thanke God my witte serveth me not to deliuer an oppinion to the Queene wch my stomake serveth not to mayntayne, one and the same Conscience of dutye, guidinge and fortifyinge me. But the untruth of the ffable God and my sovreigne can witnes and ther I leave it, knowinge noe other remedye agaynst lyes then others doe agaynst Lybells."

Bacon then speaks of—

"My defence ffor my Lo. of Essex, I am not servile to hime, havinge regarde to my superior dutye, I haue beene much bownd to him and on the other side, I doe p'teste before God, I haue spent more thoughtes and more tyme about his well doinge than ever I did about my owne."

In the same volume there is another contemporary account of the trial of Essex which entirely knocks to pieces the statements of Macaulay. Here it is reported that when Essex taunted Bacon with having written letters in his name (letters to help him with the Queen) Bacon replied :—

"He had spent more however to make him a good s'vante to her Matie than ever he des'ved, for any thinge conteyned in those letters they wold not blushe in the clearest light."

The letters are extant, and show that Bacon's statement was in every respect true.

Again, in his "Apologie" Bacon wrote that he had given the Queen "distress and distrust, in crossing her disposition, by standing steadfastly for my Lord of Essex," and that he "writ to her two or three words of complement, signifying to her Majesty that if she would be pleased to spare me in my Lord of Essex cause, out of the consideration she took of my obligation towards him, I should reckon it for one of her greatest favours. . . . The next news that I heard was that we were all sent for again, and that her Majestie's pleasure was we should all have parts in the business; and the Lords falling into distribution of our parts, it was allotted to me that I should set forth some undutiful carriages of my Lord in giving occasion and countenance to a seditious pamphlet, as it was termed, which was dedicated to him." Bacon struggled hard to get out of the business, but without success. In spite of all this evidence Mr. Sidney Lee declares that Bacon came forward and *voluntarily* gave his services in the prosecution of Essex. For the statement he does not

hold a particle of evidence. All this happened in 1601. According to Macaulay, Lord Campbell, Sidney Lee, Abbott, and others, Bacon "for some time after Essex's execution was looked upon with great aversion." Was he? There was an election in the same year, and, instead of being pelted with rotten eggs, Bacon had a double return; he was elected for his own constituency, Ipswich, and also for St. Albans.

I set against the verdict of Lords Campbell and Macaulay that of Hepworth Dixon, who writes:— "Bacon owed nothing to Essex that could have tempted even a weak man to take the wrong side instead of the right side. He owed his allegiance to his country and to truth. He was as much the Queen's officer, armed with her commission, bound to obey her commands, as her Captain of the Guard. He had no part in the Earl's crime, and utterly abhorred his means, his associates, and his ends. To have done more than he did in the conduct of this bad drama might have been noble and patriotic; to have done less would have been to act like a weak girl, not like a great man."

Those who would see the case for Bacon put squarely and fairly should consult Spedding's "Evenings with a Reviewer," Vol. I., p. 180, from the passage, "According to Bacon's scale of duties, the degrees were—first, your God; next, your king and country; then your friend; last, yourself," to the passage, "Bacon stood forward to take his share of the odium, and would not (for fear of what men might say) shrink from justifying cause which he knew to be just."

Bacon did more for Essex than Essex ever did for Bacon. Had it not been for Essex's pernicious "influence" setting the Cecil faction against their talented kinsman, Bacon would have obtained office in the reign of Elizabeth, and would not have been com-

pelled to wait till his forty-sixth year for the post of Solicitor-General, which was conferred on him in the fourth year of the reign of King James. When I say the "pernicious influence" of Essex I do not mean that it was so by his own design. His advocacy of Bacon was too importunate; he wearied and sickened by his too eager and imperious solicitations, and he defeated his own object, his friendly intervention really doing more harm than good. In 1594 Bacon wrote to his brother, "For against me she (the Queen) is never peremptory but to my Lord of Essex."

Essex was one of the most impulsive men that ever lived, and one of the most self-willed, quite incapable of taking good advice from anyone when it crossed his own humour. All that Bacon and his brother Anthony got from him for their services was the house at Twickenham. All that Bacon got from the Queen for his long service was a portion of Catesby's fine, the reversion of the registrarship of the Star Chamber (for which appointment he waited in vain for twenty years) and the dignity of Queen's Counsel, with no salary attached thereto. Had Bacon been less able and more servile, he would not have waited so long as he did for reward. But, as at the present time, so it was in the days of Queen Elizabeth—it was not the man who worked hardest in politics for his party and who deserved promotion that commanded it. Otherwise Bacon would have been Solicitor-General long before he had reached the age of forty-six.

GEORGE STRONACH.

"HOW WAS IT POSSIBLE?"

SEVEN years ago, when the doctrine of Bacon's universal authorship was beginning to stir minds, and naturally to raise objections, the simple and definite statement was repeatedly made that "the thing was *impossible;*" no man could have had time (had he even faculties and knowledge sufficient for the task) to produce the stupendous amount of work, pre-eminently excellent in every branch, which is now claimed for Bacon, and piled up on the pyramid of learning and science, philosophy and poetry, of which he is accounted the acmè.

In a brief paper printed in this Magazine, I replied to these reasonable contentions, showing how men, comparatively unknown or unimportant, are accredited with the authorship of *a mass of works* such as ordinary modern writers appear to consider Bacon utterly incapable of producing. For instance, according to Isaac D'Israeli, *Barthius* "*wrote a whole library,*" and *Lope de Vega** "composed during his life 133,225 sheets, and about 21,300,000 verses."

More than this is not claimed for Francis Bacon, and since such computations have been made, held good, and taken as fair estimates with regard to the works of other men so, referring inquirers to my former paper, I now take upon me to assume Bacon's ubiquitous authorship *as more than possible*, and to advance the further proposition, "*How was it possible?*"

Whilst putting forward my own views and conclusions, I desire to take upon myself the onus and responsibility of stating them. Although they result from long and curious research, some of them are as yet, I know, incapable of direct documentary proof such as the soul desireth. I can only say, This I have found, thus I con-

* BACONIANA, April, 1896. "Is it possible?" Vol. IV. 70—76.

clude; and the arguments may not fit other minds of a different shape from my own. Hence the obnoxious first person singular in which this little paper is penned. I write as a free lance, and desire to bring contempt and discredit upon no one but myself. Yet, if nothing is ever to be discussed until it has been proved, how are new ideas to escape into the air and light, out of the prison-house of the old ones?

To the question then:—"*How was it possible*" that in days when (according to the great master's own showing), learning was at the lowest ebb—"*How was it possible*" that one man could raise it up, and convert the reign of Elizabeth from an age of iron to the golden age of art, literature, and poetry, of which England now boasts?

I do not address those who live in full faith of the glories of "Good Queen Bess," and of the "Galaxies of Wits" who adorned her Court, and who, without any apparent preliminary training, suddenly, simultaneously, and in wondrously harmonious chorus broke forth into song. I confess to being impressed neither with the goodness of the one, nor the galaxies of the others, and I would urge those who seriously desire to follow up this subject, to begin from the beginning, and to realise the truth of Bacon's repeated regrets as to the ignorance, darkness, and misery of the age in which he found himself, the lack even of *words* in which to express the thoughts seething in his own mind; no grammar, dictionary, or elementary English school books of value; the sciences, poor, and weakly handled; learning reduced to words without matter, and taught in Latin by reason of that same poverty of the English language; the Muses "barren virgins," poetry and the theatre in the lowest state of degradation.

So Francis Bacon found things when he conceived his magnificent idea of the "Universal reformation of

the whole wide world." He was at that time a lad of fifteen, "young in years, but old in wisdom and understanding," and there is reason to believe that he had already written, and was in process of writing poetry and other works destined to pass as the productions of men of mature years, *authors* of earlier and of *much later date* than is usually affixed to books supposed to have been printed during the lifetime of Francis St. Alban.

As in boyhood he found the world of science and literature, so (excluding from the inquiry his own and ever-augmenting works) he found it still, when in 1623, he once more, and with undiminished emphasis, summed up the conclusions arrived at and printed, some twenty years earlier. "Of myself," he said, "I am silent," but meanwhile the great restauration was begun, the huge machinery was nearly completed, and partly set in motion. For a huge machine there was; so ingenious, so complex, and yet when complete, so simple to direct, that to this day nothing has put it out of order, nothing has stopped its working quietly, almost secretly, always persistently, and with unremitting attention from its engineers, and many stokers. It is clear that Francis had hardly framed his scheme before he began to feel the need of help. Those who will carefully consider the entries in the early folios of the *Promus* will probably trace for themselves the course which the writer's reflections were taking. The analysis is too lengthy for this place, but we see that his thoughts are very deep and very high, and his spirit stirred and anxious. The third sheet ends with one word, "*Oremus.*" "Let us pray."

It seems to have been now, when looking about for possible help, that he weighed, after his manner, the respective advantages of two classes of men to whom he could turn. There were the potent, grave, and reverend seniors, whose calm and cautious judgments,

with all the experience of advised age, would be most useful if authority were required, or if any measure were to be carried through by the weight of dignity, position, wealth, and so forth. But would such men be likely to forward his new and unprecedented plans? Would they not set them down as hair-brained follies, presumptuous conceit, midsummer madness? Would they not have been likely to throw cold water upon his enterprises, to dash his hopes, and retard advance? The notes on "Youth and Age" in the *Hist. Vitæ et Mortis*, which he afterwards (as "*Shakespeare*") distilled into verse, show sufficiently, perhaps too trenchantly, the "contraries" in this case, and make us quite sure that, under similar circumstances we should have chosen the *young* men rather than the old, to form the co-operative society, and band of brothers, who would carry out its aims. In youth, we read, the blood is hot, the passions quick, the spirit plentiful and effervescent, dense and fresh, the senses quick and entire, fervent and inexperienced of evil, and so inclined to religion and devotion; a young man's wishes are vehement, he is desirous of great things; but liberal, generous, and philanthropic.

Old age is less amiably represented, not only as phlegmatic, and inclined to be sour and melancholy; but also as cold, hard, suspicious or distrustful, wise for itself, avaricious, and self-seeking. Against this is set the advantage on the side of age, that, though less ready in invention, old men are more powerful in judgment, and prefer a safe and sound to a specious course. Nevertheless we see that for the special purposes required by Francis, the young are the best fitted, and so, sure enough, we find him taking steps to secure the kind of allies without whom he could not hope to do much. It would not be difficult to draw up a goodly list of names, and bright names,—which shine on the pages of literary

history as authors, wits, minor poets, &c., and of others who seriously studied natural philosophy and physics under Francis in later years—young men to whom he imparted his experiments and discoveries, and who helped him in the technical parts. Whenever they undertook some special branch, or worked out and rendered practical the original idea which he had imparted, he made over to them the whole credit of it. He remained behind the curtain, and the world rewarded him by wondering how he could be so prosaic or so deadly dull as to take no interest, and to omit all comment on the works of Spenser, Marlowe, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, and the rest; or how a man of professedly large and liberal mind could be so narrow and grudging, as to ignore all the great scientific discoveries of the day, such as those of Gilbert on magnetism, and William Harvey of the circulation of the blood. There are, however, not a few who know the truth, and for my own part, I think that these should provide the old world with a new pair of spectacles.

In 1608 we see from Bacon's MS. table-book that the "Fraternity" of his youth was working; but the young men who composed it now regarded him as a father, not a brother or equal; he calls them his sons, as elsewhere he has called them *Auroræ Filii*, Sons of the Morning, and Sons of Science: he is preparing to rouse their interest, and to procure their assistance in the interpretation of nature and of practical science. Some of the entries in his table-book under the date July 26th, 1608, enlighten us incidentally, but with clear illuminating rays, as to intended "Methods" for advancing his Herculean enterprises, and also for the ordering of his great secret society, so far as the section including the Sons of Science was concerned; for, much as he desired to draw to himself these many nimble

wits and able pens, and to give them personal interest in, and incentives to the work, there must nevertheless be method, discipline, and even secresy in all that was done, and several of the entries have a symbolic trefoil in the margin, which, to my own mind suggests that such notes were to apply especially to the Rosicrucian brotherhood. He has previously jotted down memoranda of men of position and power as well as men of science, the "likest" of their kind to be inclined to experimenting, and also to help him "to gayne entrance into the inner of some great persons," for without "place," personal dignity, or influence, would it not be difficult to ally to himself, and to utilise the most hopeful amongst the educated youths of the time, or to collect a sufficient number of the able scribes, collators, translators, &c., now so necessary to him? He therefore tried (we know how hard he tried, and how his efforts have been by modern writers misrepresented) to get appointed to some place where his powers and genius could have fair play. The death of Elizabeth had opened up a more hopeful prospect for him; but still matters moved slowly. Amongst his papers we now find the following notes:—

"Query of learned men beyond the seas to be made, and harkenying who they be that may be so inclined."

(We ask *what the learned men were to be made?* Members of his secret society?).

Further on we read:—

"Imparting my cogitata et visa wth choyse, *ut videbit.*"

"Qu(ery) of an oration *ad filios,** delightful, sublime, and mixt with elegancy, affection, novelty of conceyt, and yet sensible, and superstition."†

Then follows a sketch of the "works" to be under-

* This is omitted from the Index to Spedding's "Letters and Life." † *Free from* superstition?

taken. First, a History of "Marvailes," a historie of all sorts for matters strange in nature . . . to be compiled with judgment and all the popular errors detected.* . . . An Historie Mechanique, to be compiled . . . of the experiments and observations of all mechanical arts, the instruments and engins requesite; then the use and adoperation of everie instrum^{t}; then the woork itself and all the processe thereof, wth the tymes and seasons of doing every part thereof. Then the errors w^{ch} may be comytted, and agayn those things w^{ch} conduce to make the woorke in more perfection. Then all observacions, axiomes, directions. Lastly all things collaterall, incid^{t} or intervenient."

Having listened to the sublime and delightful discourse which should treat of all these things, we cannot doubt that the Sons of Science must have felt that they had their work cut out for them; and here follows a series of notes of his own proposed system of management, and of the steps which he must take in order to carry out his plans. Again we read:—

"Layeing for a place to command wytts and pennes. Westminster, Eton, Wynchester, spec(ially) Trinity College in Cambrig, St. Jhons in Camb., Maudlin College in Oxford; and bespeaking this betymes wth y^{e} king, my L. Archb., my L. Treasorer."

"Qu. of young scholars in y^{e} Universities. *It must be the post nati.*"

Here we see that he begins with the public school boys, and proceeds to the universities. Let those who will, extract the names of young contemporaries of Francis, Lord Verulam, and see how many from these schools and colleges became afterwards known as "authors," "poets," or philosophers and divines. Now we see him planning to give *pensions* to four of his

* Such a compilation was later on published with the title of "*Vulgar Errors*," by "Dr. Thomas Browne."

young scholars for research in order to compile the two histories "*ut supra*;" he also meditates founding a College of Inventors, and (evidently to encourage and arouse emulation) there are to be galleries with statues of inventors past, and spaces or bases for inventors to come.

At the point in the notes now reached it becomes plain that the young scholars, although drawn to their great master by true interest in his work and by every art which might make their own share in it attractive and pleasant, were yet to be bound by strict rules and obligations, subjected, like all else that Bacon attempted, to "order, Heaven's first law;" to method, discipline, and even to obligations of secresy and traditional regulations.

Opposite to the next marginal trefoil we find the following notes :—

"Qu(ery) of the Order and Discipline, to be mixt wth some poynts popular to invite many to contribute and joyne."

"Qu. of the rules and prœscripts of their studyes and inquyries. Allowance for travailing; allowance for experim^{ts}, intelligence and correspondence wth y^{e} universities abroad."

"Qu. of the maner and prœscripts touching secrecy, tradition, and publication."

"Qu. of Remooves and Expulsions in case wth in a tyme some Invention woorthy be not produced. And likewise Qu. of the honors and Rewards for Inventions."

It is clear that stenography or shorthand writing was well understood by Bacon, who, I believe, himself introduced the use of it, adapting and developing the art from ancient Eastern methods, and teaching it to his scribes. His "lodge" at Twickenham seems to have been practically a *scriptorium* where he kept busy many "idle pens," and the succession of handbooks pub-

lished in his time, each a sort of enlargement or improvement upon the other, proves how quickly and thoroughly the use of shorthand became understood and popularised.

This helps to account for the "celerity" which William Rawley noted as one of the extraordinary facts connected with his dear master's method of writing—a swiftness and facility past his powers of description. Earlier in life Francis had chewed and digested all that was to be found in the old world writings; later on his friends were so amazed at the "universality of the knowledge" which flowed from him that, like Rawley, they were inclined to ascribe it to a kind of inspiration. "For though he was a great reader of books, yet he had not his knowledge from books, but from some grounds and notions from within himself." Peter Boener, Bacon's domestic "apothecary," adds the bit of confirmatory evidence that he "seldom saw him take up a book. He only ordered his chaplain and me to look in such and such an author for a certain place, and then he *dictated to us early in the morning what he had invented and composed during the night.*"

Aubrey in his "*Life of Hobbes,*" Vol. II., Part II., p. 602, states: "The Lord Chancellor Bacon . . . was a very contemplative person, and was wont to contemplate in his delicious walks at Gorhambury and *dictate* to Mr. Bushell or some other of his gentlemen that attended him with ink and paper ready to set downe presently his thoughts."

The whole of the Apopththegms were, it is stated, dictated *from a sick bed in one day!*

On his falling into disfavour, it is related "one told his Lordship it was now time to looke about him. He replyed, 'I doe not looke *about* me, I looke *above* me.'"

No wonder that "Ben Jonson" (*Johnson,* one of his able pens), should, some years after his master's dis-

appearance and supposed death, write of him in terms which, though known to many, are seldom commented upon by Bacon's antipathetic critics.

"My conceit of his person was never increased towards him by his place or honours; but I have and do reverence him for the greatness that was only proper to himself, in that he seemed to me ever by his work one of the greatest of men, and most worthy of admiration that hath been in many ages. In his adversity I ever prayed that God would give him strength, for greatness he could not want. Neither could I condole in a word or syllable for him, as knowing no accident could do harm to virtue, but rather help to make it manifest."*

Would that many wits and able pens, fresh from the Universities and not yet entangled in the meshes of this complicated life, nor fast-bound in mind or conscience by vain and effete vows of secrecy, and by traditional obligations—would that such Sons of the Morning may be moved to devote some portion of their time, brains, money and energies to the revelation of the true life and history of this "most prodigious wit," this "Concealed Poet," this Miracle of Men, of whom it was declared by one of his most inward friends that "if ever there were a beam from Heaven upon any man, it was upon him."

CONSTANCE M. POTT.

"VIRGIL takes up the lighted torch of Homer and hands it on to Dante, who passes it to the genius behind the Shakespeare mask—Francis Bacon. Thus the 'handing on of the lamp for posterity' has been kept going by a chain of giant poets, who, like the distant peaks of some mighty range of Alps, beckon and nod to each other o'er the cloudland of ignorance and above the mists of the ages."—*W. F. C. Wigston.*

* Jonson's *Discoveries.*

"THE work, therefore, of the *Instauration* was an original, and a work so vast and comprehensive in its design that though others in that age might hew out this or the other pillar, yet of him alone it seemeth true that he framed the whole model of the House of Wisdom. The great cause of his suffering is, to some, a secret. I leave them to find it out by his words to King James: '*I wish,*' said he, '*that as I am the first so I may be the last of sacrifices in your times.*' And when from private appetite it is resolved that a creature shall be sacrificed, it is easy to pick up sticks enough from any thicket whither it hath strayed to make a fire to offer it with. But whatsoever his errors were, or the causes of his misfortunes, they are overbalanced by his virtues and *will die with time.*"—"An Account of all the Lord Bacon's Works." London, printed for R.C. at the Rose and Crown, in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1679.

BACON, PYTHAGORAS, AND SECRECY.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In a work entitled, *Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène* ("B J.") Paris, 1671. I have met with the following reference to Bacon :—

"*Pythagore faisoit une religion du secret. Le Chancelier Bacon que j'estime guères moins que Pythagore le compte entre les mystères les plus saints de sorte que selon la morale de ces deux grands hommes on ne peut révéler un secret sans commettre en même temps une espèce de sacrilège.*"

Perhaps you can kindly tell me whether among the published works of Francis Bacon there exists any passage in which secresy is thus extolled as a sacred mystery. If, as I believe, none such exists, it would be interesting to learn from whence the French writer derived his ideas.

I am, &c., H. B.

NOTES ON RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

"*Shakespeare's Forerunners.*" Sidney Lanier. Royal 8vo. 2 Vols. 30/- (Heinemann).

"*A New Portrait of Shakespeare.*" John Corbin. Pott 4to. 5/- (Lane).

"*The Age of Shakespeare.*" Seccombe and Allen. Post 8vo. 2 Vols. (Bell). Vol. I., Poetry and Prose, 3/6; Vol. II., Drama, 3/6.

"*Philobiblon: the Love of Books.*" Richard de Bury. Pott 8vo. 1/- (Moring).

IT is as a poet that the late Sidney Lanier is principally known in this country. The book now before us—"Shakespeare's Forerunners"—consists mainly of lectures delivered to American literary students. Mr. Lanier's literary executors have produced an attractive piece of bookmaking, marred in several places by reprehensible errors of carelessness. For example, the title-page of a copy of the anonymous 1633 edition of Marston's plays, apparently belonging at one time to Ben Jonson, for it bears his autograph, is reproduced in facsimile, and described as "Title-page of Ben Jonson's Tragedies and Comedies." Obviously the perpetrator knew little of Ben Jonson, and still less of John Marston. Volume I. is prefaced by the Droeshout First Folio portrait of William Shakespeare, but the American engraver, dissatisfied apparently with the actor's countenance, has endeavoured to infuse into it a poetic and intellectual cast by shading and retouching the eyes.

Mr. Lanier's share in the work is well done. His style is singularly charming, and he has a fine enthusiasm for his subject:—

"If any one should say there is not time to read these poets, I reply with vehemence that in any wise distribution of your moments, after you have read the Bible and Shakspere, you have

no time to read anything until you have read these : nay, if we come down to the things that have real meaning in life, I declare to you, especially to you women, that you have no time to eat, nor to drink, nor to sleep, until you have at least placed yourself in position to receive and reverently understand the message which comes to you out of the mouths of these old artists. They are so noble, so manful, so earnest ; they have put into such perfect music that protective tenderness of the rugged man for the delicate woman which throbs all down the muscles of the man's life and turns every deed of strength into a deed of love ; they have set the woman, as woman, upon such adorable heights of worship, and by that act have so immeasurably uplifted the whole plane upon which society moves ; they have given to all earnest men and strong lovers such a dear ritual and litany of chivalric devotion ; they have sung us such a high mass of constancy to our love ; they have enlightened us with such celestial revelation of the possible Eden which the modern Adam and Eve may win for themselves by faithful and generous affection ; that—I speak it with reverence—they have made another religion of loyal love and have given us a second Bible of womanhood." (Vol. I., p. 7).

It is when in this vein that Mr. Lanier is at his best. On the other hand, in many parts of the book—notably the imaginary life of Shakespeare—"thought runs gracefully free from the trammels of precision," and much is mere airy conjecture.

Of a different calibre is Mr. Corbin's "New Portrait of Shakespeare." The author essays to establish the authenticity of the so-called Ely Palace portrait, and to prove that this was the picture from which Droeshout engraved his celebrated First Folio plate. In order to push home his point it is necessary to discredit the so-called Droeshout "original" recently presented to Stratford-on-Avon by Mrs. Flower. The likeness, however, between this and the First Folio plate is too close to admit of a doubt that the two are intimately related ; either the print was taken from the painting, or the painting from the print. Mr. Corbin believes that

the print was the parent of the painting, and his arguments are so plausible as to be practically convincing. Perhaps his strongest point is that the painting resembles more closely the engraving *in its late retouched state* (1685) than the original impression of 1623 which so aroused Ben Jonson's enthusiasm. Apparently, then, the painting is a late copy of the 1685 engraving. The inscription on the portrait comes in for criticism, but Mr. Corbin omits to comment upon the spelling of the name, although this is, it seems to us, a particularly strong point in his favour. If Mr. William Shaksper sat for his portrait the name would almost certainly be spelled in one of the several ways used by the sitter, and this would be anything *except* that which is inscribed in highly suspicious "cursive" characters. The *spelling* of the inscription, "Willm. S-h-a-k-e-s-p-e-a-r-e," appears to us to render it highly probable that both the picture and the spelling were inspired by the Droeshout First Folio engraving.

Although Mr. Corbin succeeds in thoroughly discrediting the Flower-Droeshout original, he fails to convince us of the genuineness of the Ely Palace picture, and so it follows that there is in all probability no genuine painting of the Stratford player in existence.

Messrs. Seccombe and Allen's "Age of Shakespeare" is a concise hand-book to the literature of the period. Among other useful information it gives in the form of chronological tables representative *coups d'œil* over our literature from 1579 to 1631. One cannot fail to respect Messrs. Seccombe and Allen for the amount of labour that has been put in these two volumes. It is only when the authors branch out into criticism of a subject of which they obviously know very little that they cease to be admirable. We can scarcely comprehend any responsible person at the present day writing such shallow nonsense as the following:—

"The only branch of knowledge for which Bacon really did anything is the barren knowledge of how to trade upon the folly, the vanity, the selfishness of mankind."

In their eagerness to frame a euphonious sentence they sacrifice sense, and applaud stilted little Alexander Pope as "the *brightest* and meanest of our poets" (!) Further, they oracularly assert that "the paradox of Bacon's character will never be summed up more tersely than by Pope."

Sentiments so crude as these are sufficient to make the spirit of James Spedding weep. They detract very seriously from the value of an otherwise sound and excellent work.

We are somewhat surprised to note the severity with which the "perfect army" of Shakespearean "critics, investigators, and theorists" are summed up:

"So *exalté* has been the enthusiasm of some of the last that they have not hesitated to fabricate evidence in support of their particular views; and few perhaps have emerged from controversy on the subject who have not been scathed to the extent of stating as facts what they knew to be merely conjectures."

We would commend this passage to the attention of the affable and urbane scribe who wrote recently in *The Academy* that:—

"The whole of the pullulating mess of mushroom literature which has sprung up around the (Bacon-Shakspeare) question in recent years is the production of writers who, even where they are not actually dishonest, are at least incapable of dealing with any literary problem in accordance with the canons of sound reasoning."

Mr. Alexander Moring's charming re-issue of Richard de Bury's "Philobiblon" comes at an opportune moment. Upon more or less every page of this classic Bacon's indebtedness to De Bury is apparent. We merely note one passage which may—perhaps not

improbably—have been the original germ of the hyphenated pseudonym SHAKE-SPEARE. In Chapter XII., entitled "A Vindication of Poetry, and Its Utility," it is written :—

"The wisdom of the ancients devised a remedy by which to entice the wanton minds of men by a kind of pious fraud, the delicate Minerva secretly lurking beneath the mask of pleasure."

As everyone knows the delicate Minerva,—Pallas, the Goddess of Wisdom,—received her name "either because she killed the giant Pallas, or perhaps *from the spear which she seems to brandish in her hands.*" *

Ben Jonson appears to have perceived very clearly the delicate Minerva lurking beneath the mask of the First Folio, for in his introductory verses he says, Shakespeare

"Seems to shake a lance
As brandished at the eyes of ignorance."

It is curious that the wanton minds of men will not recognise the features of their kindly and self-effacing physician, nor will they yet apparently forgive the "pious fraud" by which he lured them to assimilate his philosophy.

Shakespeare in Japan.

On February 22nd, at the Meijida Theatre, Tokyo, Shakespeare's *Othello* was given after Japanese fashion for the first time, Kawakami being the Moor, and Madame Sada Yacco Desdemona. —*The Athenæum.*

* Lempriere.

THE INVENTION OF THE BILITERAL CIPHER.

NOT a little of the discussion concerning the existence of the Biliteral Cipher in the works of Francis Bacon has centred about the fact that Italian type in two forms in the same text existed in books printed before Bacon's time, that this use increased during the period in which he wrote, and was continued long after his death. This has led to many conjectures. By some it is thought to be an irrefutable argument against the use for cipher purposes in the books in which the cipher has been found; by others, that it is an evidence that its use was not confined to Bacon, but was much more widely extended, was familiar to many writers besides Bacon, and used long after his day entirely for cipher purposes.

I have in various ways sought to make plain what seems to me the real explanation, and may, in this connection, repeat what is already familiar to some readers. Many, however, do not understand it, and this is my excuse for further brief reference to the subject.

It is conceded that Bacon was the inventor of the Biliteral system. Inventions usually result from the suggestion or adaptation of something already in existence. How mixed fonts came to be used before Bacon's time, is impossible to ascertain. The poverty or necessities of some printing-office compelling "a make shift" to supply the lack of italic type may have been the beginning. To some other printer it appeared as "a new style," and was adopted as the latest fashion.

Bacon saw that by method in the arrangement of these two forms of letters already at hand, a cipher could be enclosed in the printed page, yet attract no attention—that it would be absolutely undiscoverable

without the key—and he incorporated a communication in his first book, *The Shepherds' Calendar* of 1579. The success and secrecy of his plan became at once apparent, and it was continued in his writings. Publishers of other books observed the permanence of "the new fashion" of two forms of type, and followed it for no particular reason, until a considerable part of the literature of the day appeared in this mixed form. The larger the number of books printed in this manner, with no method in the arrangement of the letters, the greater the safety of the hidden matter in those of Bacon; and the disclosures show that he, becoming bolder, ventured to place the gravest secrets of his life in this two-formed type. The very success of its hiding caused him at length to fear that he had done his work too well, and that he must give some hint of its existence, or it would never be discovered. In 1605, we have the first mention of a Biliteral Cipher, but it was not until 1623 that the full explanation of it was given, after it had been in use forty-four years.

I have found the cipher in Bacon's works up to 1635. In one case—that of *Sylva Sylvarum*—I found the cipher in the edition of 1635, but not in one of later date nor in one of earlier. The letters in two forms are there, but indiscriminately placed.

I have examined the works of many authors—books printed in Bacon's lifetime and before, in which these differing forms of letters appear—but have failed to find in them the Biliteral method in groups of five. I do not say that no cipher exists in these books, but that the method delineated by Bacon in *De Augmentis* does not exist in those I have thus far examined.

I come to the conclusion, therefore, and this is confirmed in the cipher writings, that Bacon selected his types from those in general use, and that after his death the cipher was incorporated in the editions printed by Rawley, or some other confidant of Bacon, but not in all the editions that appeared.

Time and strength were wanting to continue the examination of Rawley's later editions, but there is every reason to believe that, at least, some of these contain a continuation of the hidden writings.

ELIZABETH WELLS GALLUP.

NOTES, QUERIES, AND CORRESPONDENCE.

The Bacon Society *(Incorporated)*.

The present Number of Baconiana has, we regret, been delayed in expectation of a promised article dealing with the future plans of the newly incorporated Bacon Society. As, however, there appears to be a prospect of further delay, we have decided to wait no longer, but to go to press. The Society's Rooms at No. 11, Hart Street, Bloomsbury, are in the meantime open every afternoon except Sunday, and the Secretary will be glad to answer enquirers.

Bacon and Germany.

The Annual Meeting of the German Shakespeare Society took place on April 23rd, at Weimar, when Professor Dr. Brandl, of Berlin, was elected President, in place of the late Dr. Oechelhaüser. After the business of the Society, an interesting lecture, upon "Der Shakespeare Monolog und Seine Spiele," was given by Dr. Eugen Kilian, of the Royal Theatre, Karlsruhe. A luncheon for the Members of the Society, and the performance of the first part of *King Henry IV.*, followed. Weimar's daily paper, *Deutschland*, published in tabulated form seventy concise reasons to prove that Bacon was Shakespeare. A Munich writer, a day previous to the Society's Meeting, in the same paper, urged the Society to awake to its duties in regard to the inscription to be placed upon the Shakespeare stature to be erected opposite the famous Goethe and Schiller memorial outside the Weimar Theatre. He deems it the business of the Society to see that Bacon's, as well as Shakespeare's, name appears in the inscription.—*The Literary World.*

The Controversy in Paris.

NOT only in Germany, but likewise in France, the Baconian theory appears to be winning its way. The Parisian Review, *Etudes*, (May 20, 1903)* contains the first of a series of articles, entitled, "Shakespeare ou Bacon." The writer, who is, apparently, a convinced Baconian, appraises our volcanic opponents as follows :—

"Avec une libertè toute Shakespearienne les defenseurs de la vielle tradition traitaient leurs adversaires de *lunatic*, de *cranks* et de *most stupid people*, ce qui constitue une manière d' argumenter tres vielle, pas très rare et extrêmement aisée, mais pardessus tout inefficace."

The Monthly Review.

THE *English Churchman* notes that the May number of the *Monthly Review* contains two articles dealing with the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy, "*if controversy it can justly be called, when we reflect that new fangled folly is arrayed on one side, and scholarship and unbroken tradition on the other.*"

Mr. Atkinson's contribution is dealt with elsewhere. The trend of the Editorial mind may be judged by the following allusion to Mrs. Gallup and Mrs. Pott :—

"Many an adventurer has plunged with a gallop down that phantom highway and gone to pot in the end."

Accustomed as we are to the manners and habits of the erudite Shakespearean, it is still somewhat surprising to meet with this "wit" in the publication of a firm with the reputation of John Murray. The *Monthly Review* having recently printed *three* antipathetic articles upon the subject, it occurred to us to enquire of its

* Victor Retaux, Libraire Editeur. Rue Bonaparte, 82, Paris.

editor whether he would be willing to insert a Baconian reply. The answer was as follows:—

"I shall be glad to *read* an answer to Mr. Atkinson's paper if you publish one in your Review (BACONIANA); but I fear *I shall be unable to find room for it here.* With thanks for your offer,
"I am, &c."

We print this letter because, unfortunately, it is typical of the difficulties that Baconians experience in obtaining a hearing. An editor has the right to decide what shall or shall not appear in his magazine; yet it is none the less unjust to permit a sinister attack upon a great Englishman, while his defenders are withheld the opportunity of reply.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE GREEK TRAGEDIES.

MR. SIDNEY LEE, in his *Life of Shakespeare*, observes, that "Shakespeare had no title to rank as a classical scholar." He adds:—

"The rudiments of Greek were occasionally taught in Elizabethan Grammar Schools to very promising pupils; but such coincidences as have been detected between expressions in Greek plays and in Shakespearean drama seem due to accident and not to study, either at school or elsewhere, of the Athenian drama."

The series of articles by Mr. Churton Collins in the *Fortnightly Review*, entitled, "Had Shakespeare read the Greek Tragedies?" will be uncomfortable reading, not only to Mr. Sidney Lee, Canon Beeching, and other decryers of the poet's learning, but to all admirers of Shakespearean "scholarship and unbroken tradition."

Mr. Collins cites a number of passages, proving that Shakespeare drew largely from the Greek Tragedies—a fact that has always been asserted by Baconian students. In a leading article on April 6th, the *Daily News* made the following comments:—

There is one application of the theory which perhaps Mr. Churton Collins has overlooked. It arises from the possibility of the writer only succeeding in establishing one-half of his case. Suppose he proves that the author of the passages he cites must have known Latin, and that he fails to prove that Shakespeare did know it, or could have known it sufficiently for the purpose, will he not strengthen the hands of the Baconians?

But it is right to say that in the article not a little evidence is adduced to show that Shakespeare might conceivably have acquired the necessary classical knowledge in the Grammar School at Stratford. There is nothing absolutely impossible in the supposition that he did so, except the strong evidence that, as a matter of fact, he did not. Had he done so, it is extremely hard to account for the opinion of his friends and contemporaries that he did not possess this knowledge.

. . . . .

But genius, and especially a genius like Shakespeare's, can do anything.

Up to the present, Mr. Collins' articles have been received by the literary press in silence.

The Plays of Francis Bacon.

WE print elsewhere a letter upon this subject from a correspondent in India. From Boston, U.S.A., another correspondent writes as follows:—

"It seems to me that all Baconians, active or passive, both here and in England, France, Germany, and elsewhere, ought to combine their forces instead of working so entirely separately and detachedly, therefore, in a way, less effectively than if they were pursuing a well-defined common object and policy.

"I should be glad to be one amongst others to subscribe towards the cost of this object provided the work be undertaken in an appropriate and efficient manner, commenced at once and completed (as I should think it easily might be with so much of the material already to hand) in a comparatively short time."

It is certainly desirable that the first steps towards this cosmopolitan edition should be organised in the Mother Country. In the succeeding issue of Baconiana, we hope to formulate a scheme for the efficient accomplishment of that which has now become a national duty.

Shakespeare Commemoration Day.

IT is an encouraging sign that the country is yearly becoming more awake to its indebtedness to the man whom some of us call Shakespeare, and others, Bacon. The recent birthday celebration at Stratford-on-Avon has evoked more enthusiasm than upon any previous occasion, yet strangely enough a large measure is probably due to mistaken resentment against those who are erroneously supposed to spend their time in villifying and decrying the poet's genius.

Prominent among the Stratford Commemorators was Miss Marie Corelli. Speaking as the Mouthpiece of Literature, she is reported to have said :—

"Nothing is so simple as to find fault with what you cannot do yourself. And nothing is so delightful to a very small mind as to calumniate a very great one. A sweep can, if he likes, object to the sunshine, but he cannot lessen one beam of its kindly splendour. So it is with the promulgators of the Bacon theory. Their own powers are absolutely insignificant as compared to the magnificent genius they seek to vilify. Nevertheless, as I am speaking for literature I venture to say that literary students all over the world would have long ago rejoiced to see a straight answer from Stratford-on-Avon on this subject. Because we all know that such an answer could be emphatically given were the necessary pains and scholarly care taken to do so, and the mean wrong inflicted on the dead poet could be nobly righted by his own native town. Let us hope that the world will not have to wait long before this is done."

Miss Corelli's peroration reads strangely in comparison with the statement contained in her letter of January 10th. She then said :—

"The people of this town, Stratford-on-Avon, *have* sufficient records of the living and grand personality of Shakespeare (apart from the written testimony of his friends and compeers) to enable them to smile."

We are led to assume that the decease of the smile is due to the townspeople having in the interim taken stock of their "records."

"New Shakespeareana."

THE January—March number of "*New Shakespeareana*" contains an article upon "The Sonnets," by Mr. F. C. Hunt. The April—July number is devoted entirely to the report of a debate upon the Shakespeare Bacon controversy between Dr. Appleton, Morgan, and Dr. Isaac Platt.

Bacon as Master of the Revels.

OUR attention has been drawn to the following extracts from letters to Lady Carleton and Sir Dudley Carleton, re-printed by Dr. E. H. Henderson, in his "Sidelights on English History: being Extracts from Letters, Papers, and Diaries of the Past Three Centuries." (Bell), 1900.

". . . On Tuesday it came to Gray's Inn and the Inner Temple's turn to come with their Masque, whereof Sir Francis Bacon was the chief contriver, and because the former Masque came on horseback and in open chariots, they made choice to come by water from Winchester Place to Southwarke, which suited well with their device, which was the marriage of the River Thames to the River Rhine; and their show by water was very gallant by reason of the infinite store of lights very curiously set and placed, and many boats and barges with devices of lights and lamps; with three peals of ordnance, one at their taking the water, another in the Temple Garden, and the last at their landing; which passage by water cost them more than three hundred pounds. They were received at the Pier Stairs, and great expectation there was that they should every way excel their competitors that went before them; but in device, daintiness of apparel, and, above all, in dancing, they are held excellent and esteemed for the properer men.

"But, by what ill planet it fell out I know not, they came home as they went, without doing anything, the reason whereof I cannot yet learn thoroughly; but only that the Hall was so full that it was not possible to avoid it, or make room for them; besides, that most of the ladies were in the galleries to see them land and could not get in. But the worst of all was that the king was so wearied and sleepy with sitting up almost two

nights before, that he had no edge to it. Whereupon Sir Francis Bacon adventured to entreat of his Majesty that by this indifference he would not bury them quick; and I hear the king should answer, Then they must bury him quick, for he could last no longer; but withal, he gave them very good words, and appointed them to come again on Saturday. But when their apparel had been already shewn, and their devices vented, how it will fall out God knows, for they are much discouraged and out of countenance, and the world says it comes to pass after the old proverb, 'The properer man, the worse luck.' . . ."

" . . . Our Gray's Inn men and Inner Templars were nothing discouraged for all the first dodge, but on Saturday last performed their parts exceeding well, and with great applause, both from the king and all the company. . . . The next night the king invited all the Masquers, with their assistants, to a solemn supper in the Marriage-room. . . ."

"The Plays of Francis Bacon."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

Dear Sir,—For years past it has been one of my dreams to witness the publication of a "Shakespeare" with the author's name on the title-page. At present I do not think that the time is fully ripe, but I do think that there is no time like the present in which to begin the collection of materials for the purpose even as David collected the materials with which Solomon built the temple.

For I would like this publication to be, as nearly as possible, worthy of that great Intellect, that magnificent Genius, that kindly and upright Spirit which has for centuries suffered under not only ignorance and neglect, but even misrepresentation and obloquy.

I would suggest therefore that you invite all Baconians who have the time, the leisure and the will, to take up one or more of the Plays and annotate the same as fully as his ability and the means at his disposal will admit. As each is completed it should be docketed *Hamlet, King Henry VIII.*, &c., &c., and sent to you to be pigeon-holed along with the other *Hamlets*, &c., until the time is fully ripe. Then let the Plays be divided amongst half-a-dozen able and qualified men who, with the material thus collected, would proceed to prepare them for the Press, all working in conjunction with, but under, that able lady whose "knowledge of the subject stands alone."

Do not let such a work as this be narrowed down to the limits of the demonstration that Bacon wrote "Shakespeare." That is triumphantly proved already, and should not be alluded to outside

the pages of the Preface, though, of course, parallel passages, references to the Promus, &c., would appear in the Notes. But, beyond that, let the Baconian authorship be assumed and the publication aim at being the fullest, most erudite and most monumental edition of the Plays yet published. All former editions of "Shakespeare" have been trammelled with conjecture; in a Baconian "Shakespeare" this will be reduced to a minimum, for we *know* whence Bacon got his knowledge, and we have not (as our forefathers had) to construct a man's life and nature out of his works, even as Professor Owen constructs an antediluvian monster out of a few bones.

If you, Sir, will draw out a few rules for our guidance, I am sure that there are many who would gladly assist in such a work. Here, in my Indian bungalow, with but very few books, I might not be able to be of much help, but, as two of those books are a Promus and a Concordance, I might do a little even now, and in about ten years' time I fancy that I shall have both the leisure and the means to do much more.

Of course, everyone must use an edition of "Shakespeare" in which the lines are numbered, and the text of the best. In neither of the editions which I have with me here is this done, but I can no doubt procure a *Globe* edition in the country.

However, I will now leave my proposition in your hands to improve upon or reject according as to whether you consider it feasible or impracticable.

But, for heaven's sake! do not let us overreach ourselves or treat as gospel the wild imaginings of some over-keen enthusiasts amongst us whose conjectures up to the present are, at least, non-proven.

Yours faithfully,

G. H. P. BURNE.

Bellary, Madras, April 12th, 1903.

"SHAKESPEARE'S PROSE."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In my article under this heading in the last number of BACONIANA I gave a passage from *Love's Labour's Lost*, and attributed it to *Hamlet*, in error. I trust you will allow me to make this correction, and at the same time to call your readers' attention to the extraordinary similarity between the other remarks of Holofernes in that, the earliest of the Shakespearean dramas, and the language of Bacon. Is the following not thoroughly Baconian, in spite of Spedding's *dictum:* "I doubt whether there are five lines in Shakespeare which could be mistaken for Bacon."

Holofernes says: "*Novi hominem tanquam te:* His humour is

lofty, his discourse peremptory, his tongue filed, his eye ambitious, his gait majestical, and his general behaviour vain, ridiculous, and thrasonical. He is too affected, too odd, as it were, too peregrinate, as I may call it."

It will be curious to see how Dr. Murray treats this word "peregrinate" in the New English Dictionary.

Beyond doubt the character "Armado," who is thus described, is the Spanish refugee, Antonio Perez, who in 1594 published his "Relaciones" under the assumed name of "Raphael Peregrino." The Earl of Essex took Perez under his patronage, and the Spaniard also became attached to Francis and Anthony Bacon, but it is not related that he was acquainted with William Shakespeare.

In the above passage it is of interest to note the conjunction of Latin and English met with in nearly every letter written by Bacon.

I am, &c.,

GEORGE STRONACH.

ELIZABETHAN AUDIENCES.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Those of your readers who wonder how the Elizabethan groundling, or as the poet Chapman terms him, the "unapprehending stinkard" sat through the in many cases, philosophically-prosy plays of Shakespeare may be interested in the following illuminating piece of dialogue from Ben Jonson's *Bartholemew Fair*:—

Cokes.—(An esquire of Harrow). But do you play it according to the printed book? I have read that.

Leatherhead.—By no means, Sir.

Cokes.—No! How then?

Leatherhead.—A better way, Sir. That is too learned and poetical for our audiences. What do they know what *Hellespont* is or *guilty of true love's blood?* Or what "*Abydos*" is? or the other *Sestos hight?*

Cokes.—Thou art in the right. I do not know myself.

Leatherhead.—No. I have entreated Master Littlewit to take a little pains to reduce it to a more familiar strain for our people.

It would be instructive to know into what strain, for instance, the genealogy in *Henry V.* was reduced, in order to render it acceptable to an audience "for the most part capable of nothing but inexplicable dumb shows and noise."

Yours, &c.,

S. J. PIERPOINT.

Sir Francis Bacon, Poet.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

Sir,—Howes, in his *Annales*, or *General Chronicle*, 1615, includes in his list (page 811), of excellent Poets of the time of Elizabeth, "Sir Francis Bacon, Knight." The others mentioned are Gascoigne, Churchyard, Dyer, Spenser, Sidney, Harrington, Challoner, Davie, Lillie, Chapman, Warner, Shake-speare, Daniel, Draiton, Marlo, Johnson, Marston, Francis, Meers, Silvester, Decker, Fletcher, Webster, Heywood, Middleton, and Wither. Poetry ascribed to all the above except possibly Meers, Silvester, and Bacon, had been published prior to the date of Howes' book. Judged by the list to be found on the same page, viz., Friar Bacon, Wyclife, Chaucer, Gower, Ledgate, Skelton, More, and Heywood, of persons registered "as were most famous in the high misterie of poesey, by whose singular paines and industry our native language hath from time to time beene much refined," it is possible that the term Poet may then have been used as a term of wider significance, say as a maker, inventor, an author of fiction, or even as a writer on general subjects. Perhaps some Baconian will look into the matter.

Yours, &c., P. W.

Dudley—Sutton.

"*BACONIANA*," page 64.

Query (1). Can any reader throw light on why the pseudonym of Sutton was borne by the Dudleys as early as in Henry VIII's reign?

(2). And again by Lord Dudley in Holland, his alias there being Robert Sutton?

Origin of Surnames.

Reply:—"Not a few have assumed the names of their father's Baronies, as in former times, the issue of Richard Fitz-Gilbert tooke the name of Clare which was their Baronie; and in late time since the Suttons came to the Barony of Dudly, all their issue took the name of Dudleys." . . . Extract from "Remaines concerning Brittaine," p. 123, sm. 4to., fourth impression, 1629.

Will the querist kindly quote, and give reference to the authority for the statement that the Earl of Leicester adopted the alias of Robert Sutton while commanding the forces in Holland, also to state the circumstances of the occasion?

J. F. Stevens.